

**REMARKS**

Claims 6-21 remain in this application. Claims 6-21 are rejected. Claims 1-5 were previously cancelled herein. Claims 6, 13 and 21 are amended herein to clarify the invention and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicants herein traverse and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 6-12 and 16-20 are rejected as obvious over Oh (US 5,616,078) in view of Ishikawa et al. (US 6,549,641), and further in view of Masanobu (JP 2000-033184) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness could not be established in rejection of amended claims 6-12 and 16-20. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach

or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on the applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)." MPEP §706.02(j) "Contents of a 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection".

Independent claim 6 is amended to clarify that the head positions of the game player which are measured in left and right directions, are measured relative to a fixed position of the monitor screen. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references teach or suggest such a feature.

Both Oh and Masanobu appear to be silent regarding changing a viewpoint of a virtual camera in response to head movements of a user, and the Examiner relies exclusively upon the disclosure of Ishikawa et al. as teaching this feature in support of the rejection. However, while Ishikawa et al. may disclose a device that allows a change of a viewing point in accordance with the movement of the head position of the game player, the disclosure is limited to teaching relating to a screen image display unit mounted on the head of a user which allows a virtual screen image to be viewed only by the actual user wearing such device. So mounted, the head position of the game player is not detected "in at least right and left directions relative to a fixed position of the monitor screen," as claimed in amended claim 6 and the claims dependent therefrom, since the screen, mounted on the viewer's head, moves along with the head, there being no relative movement therebetween.

In contrast to Ishikawa et al., claim 6 provides a monitor screen on which a viewpoint is changed in accordance with the position of the game player's head relative to a fixed position thereof, such that the game player can react to the opponent's actions displayed thereon as if he were actually in front of the player, rather than simulated as part of a virtual reality image. In this regard, the player could, for practical purposes, see not only the opponent on the screen, but also his own hands and body as they relate to the displayed image of the opponent. In addition, as the claimed game machine is primarily intended as an arcade type game, in contrast to the solo effects of the virtual reality type image displayed in Ishikawa et al., others observing the game player during the course of play in accordance with the claimed invention would also be entertained by the action viewable by observers as well as the game player, and perhaps be enticed, themselves, into also playing the game. The Ishikawa et al. reference can provide no such advantage.

Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claim 6, and claims 7-12 and 16-19 dependent therefrom, and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding independent claim 20, it would appear from the Office Action that the Examiner has not provided a detailed reason for the rejection. Applicants have reviewed the claim as it pertains to the cited combination of references, and believe it not to be made obvious thereby. In particular, the art of record does not teach a

game system in which a viewpoint of a virtual camera approximates a view seen by the game player, and in which interaction between the opponent character and the game player is based upon a relationship between the opponent character and the viewpoint position of the virtual camera.

Thus the combination of references fails to teach all claimed elements, as is properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 20 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 13-15 and 21 are rejected as obvious over Oh (US 5,616,078) in view of Ishikawa et al. (US 6,549,641), and further in view of Masanobu (JP 2000-033184) and Sakakawa (JP 09-173645) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the Sakakawa reference, which is offered for allegedly teaching a hitting mark displayed in a hitting area, cannot render rejected claims 13-15 obvious because the reference does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the obviousness rejection of claim 6, from which the claims depend, that is absent from each of Oh, Ishikawa et al. and Masanobu. Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 13-15 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 21, the claim is amended (as is also claim 13, for yet further distinction over the cited art) to clarify that a hitting area, which is set at at least one location on a body of the opponent character displayed on the monitor screen, moves on the monitor screen according to the movement of the opponent character. This clearly distinguishes the claimed subject matter of claims 13 and 21 over the Sakakawa reference, which differs from the claimed invention in that the hitting marks referred to by the Examiner are fixed drawings which coincide with switches disposed behind the targets and are not images formed on a monitor, the positions of which are varied in accordance with progress of the game.

Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claim 21. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 21 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:  
Frank J. Jordan  
Reg. No. 20,456  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

James J. DeLoe  
Reg No. 36,049